

## TRANSFORMING THE SELF- DEVELOPMENT DOMAIN FOR A 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY ARMY

BY

COLONEL MARSHALL K. DOUGHERTY, JR.  
United States Army

### DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.  
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2010

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.



U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE <b>30 MAR 2010</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Transforming the Self-Development Domain for a 21st Century Army</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) <b>Marshall Dougherty Jr.</b>				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>U.S. Army War College ,122 Forbes Ave.,Carlisle,PA,17013-5220</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT <b>see attached</b>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>26</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

# **PROPERTY OF U.S. ARMY**

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

## **TRANSFORMING THE SELF-DEVELOPMENT DOMAIN FOR A 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY ARMY**

by

Colonel Marshall K Dougherty, Jr.  
United States Army

Colonel John Cummings  
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College  
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

## **ABSTRACT**

AUTHOR: Colonel Marshall K Dougherty, Jr.

TITLE: Transforming the Self-Development Domain for a 21st Century Army

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 15 March 2010      WORD COUNT: 5,097      PAGES: 26

KEY TERMS: Leader Development, Leader Training, Officer Development

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Leader development is one of the most important responsibilities that we have in the United States Army. After more than eight years in combat, our Army has predictably come to rely too heavily on operational experience as the predominate driver of leader development at the expense of formal education and self development. Self-development is an area that we have typically under emphasized in the past, yet is becoming increasingly important to prepare leaders to win in the operational environment of the future.

This paper examines our current leader development doctrine, and makes recommendations on how to improve the self-development learning domain to meet the demands of the future. We can accomplish this aim by applying appropriate leadership – that is, purpose, direction, and motivation in the self-development domain by enacting the recommendations outlined in this paper. Taken all together, enacting this host of proposals will successfully strengthen our organizational culture of leader development, and better prepare our Army to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.

## TRANSFORMING THE SELF-DEVELOPMENT DOMAIN FOR A 21ST CENTURY ARMY

[O]ur Army's most important core competency – Leader Development – will produce confident, competent, versatile leaders for our 21<sup>st</sup> Century Army.<sup>1</sup>

—General George Casey

Leader development is one of the most important responsibilities that we have in the United States Army. It is critical that we make thoughtful investments in leader development in terms of time, resources, organizational energy and leader attention in order to build the bench of quality senior leaders necessary for success in the future. We are now at a point where we must adjust our leader development strategy in order to properly address the operational environment that we are in, the complex future of persistent conflict that we face, and the generational shifts in characteristics and preferences in our upcoming leader cohorts.<sup>2</sup> After more than eight years in combat, our Army has predictably come to rely too heavily on operational experience as the overly predominate driver of leader development at the expense of formal education and self development.<sup>3</sup> If we neglect the critical task of balanced leader development in order to focus on achieving the current mission, we do so at the cost of mortgaging our future. As we have become consumed by the demands of the current conflict, the realm of self-development in particular has suffered. Self-development is an area that we have typically under emphasized in the past, yet is becoming increasingly important to prepare leaders to win in the operational environment of the future.<sup>4</sup>

In this paper, I examine our current leader development doctrine, and make recommendations on how to improve the self-development learning domain to meet the

demands of the future. Although much of this material pertains to leaders of all ranks, I will focus specifically on our United States Army Officer Corps.

### A New Leader Development Strategy

The United States Army has long been recognized as having a strong tradition of quality leader development. To sustain this strength, we periodically examine how we conduct leader development, and adjust to our changing operating environment, the future we anticipate, and the evolving characteristics of our leader cohorts. We are currently in such a reassessment and adjustment phase as we approach nearly a decade of continuous combat in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. Our senior leadership has recognized the need to reassess how we develop leaders in light of a number of dynamics, to include lessons learned from recent experience and the global environment that we anticipate in the future.

First, we are approaching nearly a decade of combat in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. The focus on the current fight and the pace of deployments have had a tremendous impact on leader development, much of it positive, but some of it detrimental. In the 1990s, we debated at length on how to develop the “adaptive” leaders we deemed necessary to lead the Army in Transformation. Since then, the experiences our leaders have had at all levels in the counter insurgency fight and interagency environments in Iraq and Afghanistan have developed tremendous adaptability in our officer corps.<sup>5</sup> Our leaders have become comfortable with the idea that they will have to quickly learn new skills, develop relationships with counterparts from other cultures, both international and interagency, and continually reevaluate the impacts and effectiveness of their actions.

On the downside, some argue that we have dulled our edge for fighting and winning in a full spectrum operations environment. Due to the limited reset time available between deployments, units typically must focus on the tactical tasks and cultural training required to be successful in the counter insurgency environment at the expense of training for the full spectrum operations environment. This has produced what the Chief of Staff of the Army describes as a force “...out of balance.”<sup>6</sup>

The deployment cycle has also created a backlog in Professional Military Education (PME) as officers defer attendance to the Captains Career Course, Intermediate Level Education, and Senior Service College.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, the operational pace has adversely affected participation in Advanced Civil Schooling programs.<sup>8</sup> These consequences negatively impact the quality of our leader development in the short term, and even more concerning, may be shifting leader attitudes away from a disciplined approach to leader development over the long term. Recent evidence indicates that leaders, including senior officers, increasingly view combat experience to be the key indicator of potential and marginalize the importance of other development and education.<sup>9</sup> A former Commandant of the United States Army War College, Major General (retired) Robert H. Scales describes this troubling trend as an Army being “...too busy to learn.”<sup>10</sup>

Second, the Army has forecasted the future that we must prepare for and its impacts across the force development and modernization efforts, to include the leader development domains. The “Army Capstone Concept” describes the future as one of persistent conflict, and requiring leaders with unprecedented skills and qualities.<sup>11</sup>



Leaders must embrace a lifelong campaign of learning through a variety of mediums and experiences in order to stay abreast of a rapidly evolving operational environment.

Finally, the Army acknowledges that the generations of junior leaders we are developing have different motivation factors, interests, and are far more attuned with the social networking and internet communities than previous officer cohorts.<sup>12</sup> The Army must adapt our leader development strategy to take these differences into account, and properly attract, motivate, and retain talented leaders. In addition, we must exploit the younger generation's propensity to use on-line content and social media avenues to learn and interact with others.

In light of this evolving environment, the Army recognized that we required a new approach to leader development. To articulate this new approach, the Chief of Staff of the Army General George Casey approved and published "A Leader Development Strategy for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Army" in November 2009.<sup>13</sup> This document was shaped by lessons learned during eight years of combat, as well as the future environment that we anticipate. The document "articulates the characteristics we desire in our Army leaders as they progress through their careers," and establishes a strategy for the integration of policies, programs and initiatives to produce those leaders, through training, education, and experience.<sup>14</sup> While the document provides the overarching guidance, TRADOC has the responsibility to produce annexes with the details required for execution.

There are currently a number of working groups developing the execution annexes to translate the new Leader Development Strategy into action. Existing Army doctrine on leader development describes three domains in which leaders accrue training, education, and experience: "Institutional," "Operational Assignments," and

“Self-Development.”<sup>15</sup> While the TRADOC commander has not yet approved the annexes, the working documents indicate that the focus is largely on changes to the Institutional and Operational Assignment domains, while offering very little if any attention to the self-development domain.<sup>16</sup> This is not surprising, since these two are areas that we can most directly impact, and they require substantial resource allocation and leader attention to enact. The self-development domain, on the other hand, has historically been relatively under emphasized and under resourced. However, I feel that we have a perfect opportunity as we develop the implementation plan for the new Leader Development Strategy to include improvements in the Self Development domain. We must transform the self-development domain along with the institutional and operational domains in an integrated manner in order to best prepare our leaders to meet the challenges of the future. These changes must encompass not only our doctrine and policies, but create real change within our organizational culture as well in order to be successful. With comparatively modest investment, we can elevate the relevance and impact of this domain to the great benefit of our future leadership capital. In the remainder of this paper, I will examine current Army leadership development doctrine, and propose recommendations for improvement in the self-development domain to complement and round out the institutional and operational assignment domains.

#### Current Leader Development Doctrine

We articulate our current leader development doctrine and policies in a number of Field Manuals, Army Regulations, and Pamphlets. Our keystone leadership manual is Field Manual 6-22 “Army Leadership” (FM 6-22).<sup>17</sup> This manual establishes the fundamental doctrine and principles of leadership in the Army, to include describing our

leader development framework in broad terms. FM 6-22 defines the three core domains in which leaders accrue critical learning experiences throughout their career as *Institutional Training*, training, education, and experiences gained during *Operational Assignments*, and *Self-development*.<sup>18</sup> The manual acknowledges that these three domains interact through a variety of feedback mechanisms, and successful leader development relies heavily on individuals' honest self assessment of their strengths and weaknesses. FM 6-22 asserts that leaders must invest more time and effort in the self-development domain due to the increasing complexity of the operating environment, but provides only general guidance on how to approach this challenge.

Field Manual 7-0 "Training for Full Spectrum Operations" (FM 7-0) is more recent than FM 6-22 by two years, and therefore benefits from a refined understanding of the future operating environment. FM 7-0 establishes the Army's keystone doctrine for training, and as such, more completely articulates the three leadership development domains and refines the responsibilities of individuals and leaders for their implementation.<sup>19</sup> This manual, far more so than earlier documents, highlights that self-development is a deliberate, disciplined, and continuous effort of lifelong learning that is a team effort between leaders and their subordinate leaders.<sup>20</sup>

Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3 "Commissioned Officer Professional Development and Career Management" (DA PAM 600-3) defines in detail the developmental paths for officers in the institutional and operational domains.<sup>21</sup> It serves as the primary source delineating the career progression paths for officers by branch and functional area and the desired developmental outcomes at each level. The

document assigns responsibility for self-development to the individual officer, but does not describe how it integrates with the institutional or operational domains.<sup>22</sup>

Army Regulation 350-1 “Army Training and Leader Development” (AR 350-1) echoes the leader development doctrine from FMs 6-22 and 7-0, and provides some additional specific regulatory training requirements.<sup>23</sup> AR 350-1 also further segments the self-development domain into three types: structured self development, guided self development, and personal self-development.<sup>24</sup> It describes structured self-development as learning required throughout a career which is closely linked to classroom and job-assignment duties. Guided self-development is recommended but optional learning that keeps the individual current with progressing technical, functional, and leadership responsibilities. Finally, personal self-development is self-initiated learning defined by the individual’s own goals and pace.<sup>25</sup> While these three categories may be useful, AR 350-1 does not further suggest how to integrate them into a leader development plan.

AR 350-1 also recommends that units establish individually structured leader training and developmental action plans for each leader.<sup>26</sup> It suggests that these developmental action plans break down goals into near-term, short-term, and long-term planning horizons. Near-term goals should focus on remediating identified weaknesses and reinforcing strengths relevant to the individual’s current duty position. Short-term goals should focus on preparing for the next duty assignment, and long-term goals should prepare the leader for more complex duties beyond the next assignment.<sup>27</sup>

Finally, Department of the Army Pamphlet 350-58 “Leader Development for America’s Army” (DA PAM 350-58) defines in detail our doctrine for leader development.<sup>28</sup> This document describes the interaction between the three

developmental domains (then called pillars) and the logical progression of each throughout a leader's career. Although the fundamentals described in DA PAM 350-58 remain sound, this document was last published in 1994, and is therefore no longer completely consistent with later and emerging doctrine. We must update this document or eliminate it as we publish the execution annexes for the Leader Development Strategy for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Army.

To summarize the current Army leader development doctrine, it all incorporates the three learning domains of institutional, operational assignments, and self-development. Yet, not surprisingly, the doctrine focuses predominantly on the institutional and operational assignment domains in terms of design, requirements, and resources. The Army has long had "self-development" as an integral part of our leadership development doctrine, but we have historically not emphasized, facilitated, or resourced this domain to the degree commensurate with its importance. It is not integrated with the other two domains in any standardized or meaningful way. We say that "good" officers make time to do it themselves, and offer little more than suggested reading lists and generalized concepts to facilitate the effort.

On the whole, I think that it is fair to say that the Army has not provided adequate "Leadership" of the Self-Development domain – and I use "Leadership" in the Army definition of the term, which is, to provide "...purpose, direction, and motivation...to accomplish the mission and improv[e] the organization."<sup>29</sup> As we implement the Leader Development Strategy for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Army, we must provide leadership in the self-development domain and include it in an integrated approach with the other two domains to better prepare our leaders for the challenges of the future. In order to

accomplish this, we must provide clarified purpose, better direction, and increased motivation in addition to resources to promote the self-development domain. However, these steps are merely necessary, but not sufficient to prepare our leaders for the future. We must also work to strengthen the Army's organizational culture of leader development. In the remainder of this paper, I will outline a number of recommendations in each of the areas of *purpose*, *direction*, and *motivation* within the framework of organizational culture change in order to provide adequate leadership in the self-development domain.

### Organizational Culture Change

First, it is helpful to designate the specific definition of organizational culture that fits the United States Army. Although there are many different definitions, the one put forth by Edgar Schein in "Organizational Culture and Leadership" best fits the purpose of this paper. Schein defines organizational culture as this:

A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way you perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.<sup>30</sup>

Schein describes two categories of tools as the primary means to create and sustain meaningful change to an organization's culture: *embedding mechanisms* and *reinforcing mechanisms*.<sup>31</sup>

Strategic leaders use *embedding mechanisms* to emplace core assumptions into their organizations. In other words, to emplace the "shared basic assumptions" that form the basis of an organization's culture. Schein defines the primary embedding mechanisms as: (1) what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control, (2) how leaders react to critical incidents and organizational crises, (3) how leaders allocate

scarce resources, (4) deliberate role modeling and coaching, (5) criteria for the allocation of rewards and status, and (6) operational criteria for recruitment, selection and promotion.<sup>32</sup>

The purpose of *reinforcing mechanisms* is to support and strengthen the shared assumptions in the organization. Schein list the categories of reinforcing mechanisms as: (1) organization design and structure, (2) organizational systems and procedures, (3) rites and rituals, (4) design of physical space, facades, and buildings, (5) stories, legends, myths, and symbols, and (6) formal statements of organizational philosophy, values, and creeds.<sup>33</sup>

In order to successfully strengthen our organizational culture of leader development, leaders at all levels will have to employ a variety of embedding and reinforcing mechanisms. This is particularly true for the traditionally under emphasized self-development domain.

### Recommendations

First, we must explicitly define the *purpose* of self-development. Out of all of the current doctrine, FM 7-0 provides the most appropriate seeds for formulating a concise purpose within its description of the self-development domain.<sup>34</sup> Using FM 7-0's description as a basis, I propose that we define the purpose of the self-development domain as this:

The purpose of learning in the self-development domain is to complement and fill the gaps in institutional and operational learning in order to enhance professional competence and meet personal objectives.

We should integrate this purpose into the various doctrinal documents concerning leader development as we implement the new Leader Development Strategy. In organizational culture terms, defining this purpose serves as part of our

formal statement of organizational philosophy. Although Schein describes formal statements of organizational philosophy as a *reinforcing mechanism*, the force of doctrine in the Army and the emphasis that our senior leadership can place on it probably elevates this purpose statement to an *embedding mechanism* in importance and impact.

Once we have defined the *purpose*, we must set the *direction* for the self-development domain. Before we can do that though, we must first establish a better method of organizing the doctrine and resources that facilitate self-development. Currently, we promulgate the doctrine in a number of publications and have a variety of resources to assist in self-development, but they are not easily accessible or visible from a central location. I propose that we maximize the use of distributed learning and the on-line environment to solve this problem. This has proven to be an effective and efficient vehicle to provide current, relevant information and resources to our expeditionary force in a timely manner.<sup>35</sup> We should consolidate access to self-development doctrine and resources in an organized manner through a single website. In fact, such a website already exists in the “My Leader Development” site administered by the Center for Army Leadership (CAL). The site is easily accessible from a link on the Army Knowledge Online (AKO) homepage.<sup>36</sup> However, the “My Leader Development” site currently includes access to only a few resources. I recommend that we designate this site to be the central access point to facilitate learning in the self-development domain. It should include links to our leadership development doctrine, and the myriad of tools and learning resources currently available online, as well as the resources and products I recommend in the following paragraphs. This on-line site of



consolidated resources will serve as a *reinforcing mechanism* to strengthen our organizational culture of leader development and resonates with the preferred learning methods of the upcoming generations of officers.

Once we have established the organizing framework of the “My Leader Development” website, we can now focus on *direction* for the self-development domain. We must set this direction both in the overarching, general case, as well as provide tools to assist individuals in determining their personal direction based on their identified strengths, weaknesses, career station and path, and personal goals. To establish direction in the general sense is simple; we merely need to add links to our doctrine on leadership development and update them as it evolves. To provide adequate direction at the individual level, we must integrate an array of resources and tools into the “My Leader development” website.

Doctrine tells us that the first step in determining direction at the individual level is to conduct a thorough self assessment.<sup>37</sup> There are a number of tools available in both the civilian and military communities to assist in this effort. For example, the Army has used a variety of 360 degree feedback instruments to facilitate leader development for a number of years. One of these instruments, the Multi-Source Assessment and Feedback Program (MSAF) is available now on the “My Leader Development” website.<sup>38</sup> The MSAF Program enables an individual leader to initiate and execute an assessment online, provides the individual with a report and analysis of the feedback from himself, his superior, peers, and subordinates, and provides recommendations for action. The program also offers on-line training for those conducting and receiving the assessment as well as for leader coaches. The assessed individual can even schedule

a coaching session with a number of professional leadership coaches through the Center for Army Leadership. The MSAF Program is a fantastic example of what is possible when we exploit the advantages of the on-line environment. We must expand the resources available in this manner to conduct effective self assessment. For example, we should include the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator instrument (MBTI), the Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory (KAI), and other related instruments in order to assist individual leaders and their coaches to establish a comprehensive self-assessment picture and determine some recommended directions for improvement.<sup>39</sup>

A second component that we must add to provide adequate direction for the individual level is to describe the desired outcomes at each rank level by leader cohort. In other words, we must define what skills, characteristics, and attributes we must have in armor lieutenants when they reach their first duty assignment, for infantry majors when they report to their line unit following Intermediate Level Education, and so on. The basic outline for this matrix of desired outcomes is defined in DA PAM 600-3, and the branch and functional “Centers of Excellence” are currently working to more completely define the requirements for their respective leader cohorts.<sup>40</sup> Ideally, we should provide this matrix in an interactive electronic format on the “My Leader Development” website to serve as an *embedding mechanism*. The officer and his rater should be able to clearly identify what skills, abilities, and attributes the Army expects him to manifest at each level of progression. Since there is no longer a “standard” career progression by branch or functional area, the matrix must be flexible enough to query a variety of duties and positions the officer may anticipate holding in the future. Each of the desired outcomes could be linked to documents containing a more detailed

description as well as resources available in each of the three leader development domains able to develop those outcomes.

Another key component of a comprehensive self-development strategy is a professional reading program. The Chief of Staff of the Army as well as other senior leaders often produce required or recommended reading lists targeting a variety of audiences. Include these lists on the “My Leader Development” website organized by leader cohort. Consider offering the books as downloadable “e-books” for free or at a reduced price to further capitalize on the on-line environment and the learning preferences of the younger generation. In addition, include links to relevant articles from recent professional journals and other sources that are of significant interest to particular leader cohorts.

Finally, and perhaps most important to providing direction, we should implement an on-line, enduring, Individualized Leader Development Plan (ILDLP) that integrates all three learning domains. The baseline for this “living” document is the timeline for an officer’s career from commissioning through retirement. Although there is no longer a “standard” career path, we can predict certain milestones such as promotion, school, and command boards, and retirement eligibility with some precision and place them on the timeline. These milestones should be fed into the online ILDP automatically using information from the responsible authorities. Other information, such as the available dates for required and optional Professional Military Education (PME) as well as Advanced Civil Schooling (ACS) opportunities should be accessible in a menu format tailored to what the officer is eligible for to allow the officer to plan. The officer uses the ILDP as a tool to integrate his planned institutional and operational assignment

developmental opportunities with his structured, guided, and personal self-development goals to compliment his overall learning and fill in any identified gaps. The idea is not to force the officer into a career path template, but to provide an informed, flexible planning tool to assist him and his rater in visualizing what is possible, establishing near, short, and long term goals, defining a plan, and tracking progress. These automated functions should also have an alert function to notify the officer of any significant changes to dates or availability of relevant boards or educational opportunities.

We should help officers establish their ILDP initially as part of their education in their branch specific Basic Officer Leadership Course III (BOLC III). This action is one of the first mechanisms used to embed the expectation and habit of lifelong learning through self-development in our young officers. As the officer reports to his first unit and duty position, he reviews and expands his ILDP as part of his initial counseling with his rater. As the individual and his rater jointly develop a plan using the Developmental Support Form DA Form 67-9-1a, this counseling is informed by and feeds directly back into the online ILDP. Although the individual will change duty positions and raters periodically, the online ILDP will assist in maintaining coherence, continuity, and focus on his developmental goals, and continually reinforces our ethic of lifelong learning. In addition, the officer should be able to give permission to others to view his online ILDP, but with the ability to keep the personal goals and plan section private if desired. This will enable the individual to seek advice, coaching, and direction by jointly viewing and discussing his online ILDP with his rater, senior rater, a distant mentor, or professional leadership coach.

Finally, to support the online ILDP, we should provide a cadre of developmental “guidance counselors” available through online appointments similar to the leadership coaches we now have in the MSAF Program. These counselors would assist officers as well as their raters to develop feasible plans, and make sure they are aware of all of the relevant opportunities and resources available. Perhaps the MSAF Program coaches could expand their mission to fulfill this role, but the required expertise and situational awareness of available opportunities probably resides more within the branch assignment sections of Human Resources Command.

Currently, *motivation* is the least developed aspect of leadership in the self-development domain. FM 7-0 declares that self-development is just as important as the institutional and operational assignment learning domains, but that individuals are responsible for seeking out their own self-development opportunities.<sup>41</sup> Some argue that “...a man who requires to be driven is not worth the driving...”<sup>42</sup> However, we must take a more pragmatic approach and provide appropriate *motivation* in the self-development domain for the good of our Army. We can do this by applying a number of embedding and reinforcing mechanisms to strengthen our organizational culture of leader development.

The most important and effective embedding mechanism is leadership by example. Senior leaders must emphasize and facilitate self-development learning in both their words and actions. It is natural that the development of leaders is much more directive in nature at the junior level and transitions more towards self-directed at the senior level as individuals mature. However, self-development should remain part of the leader – led conversation even at the most senior levels. We should not downplay this

interaction, but highlight it as part of our leader development narrative when talking to the force.

A critical facet of leadership by example is to create a climate that encourages leader development, to include dedicating time for self-development. Given the deployment pace of our Army and the resulting strain on our Soldiers and families, it is not credible to expect officers to conduct self-development solely during their “off duty” time. While assignments in the institutional learning domain more often provide adequate time for officers to conduct self-development, operational assignments usually do not given the press of ongoing missions. A recent RAND study concluded that an alarmingly low percentage of officers serving in operational assignments participated in leader development activities, with the self-development category being the most neglected.<sup>43</sup> This must change, and it will require a shift in our organizational culture, led by our senior leaders, to encourage unit commanders to dedicate time for themselves and subordinates to conduct self-development.

The next step is to phase in the Developmental Support Form DA Form 67-9-1a and the online ILDP as mandatory requirements of leadership development and counseling. The use of the DA Form 67-9-1a is currently mandatory for captains, lieutenants, and warrant officers, but optional for all other ranks.<sup>44</sup> We invest too much in our officers to drop the requirement to periodically and formally review ILDPs once they are promoted to major. The focus of the developmental efforts will obviously shift as the officer advances, new opportunities arise, and the environment changes, but that is precisely the point of the flexibility and ability to individualize the online ILDP. The contract agreed upon on the Developmental Support Form between the rater and rated

officers is a *reinforcing mechanism* and must include a commitment to resource the learning effort adequately with time and educational resources.

Another reinforcing mechanism to apply to improve motivation is to mandate that in Officer Evaluation Reports DA Form 67-9 (OERs), raters comment on both the rated officer's progress on his own ILDP as well as how he has developed his subordinates. The current OER requires a block check confirming that the rated officer used Developmental Support Forms as required for his subordinates, and we should sustain this. However, if we truly believe that leader development is the most important thing that we do in the Army, we should mandate comments about how the rated officer is performing in this critical mission on his OER. In addition, the rater could highlight any special skills the rated officer has cultivated through self-development in the OER blocks for "potential" or "unique special skills or expertise."

The final embedding mechanism to enact is the establishment of an on-line professional "resume" for officers similar to a professional civilian resume'. The current Officer Record Brief DA Form 4037 (ORB), even when augmented by the associated file of Officer Evaluation Reports DA Form 67-9 (OERs), is often not descriptive enough to query and "hire" the right officer for a particular job. It does not adequately capture all of the benefits of education, training, experiences, and self-development to accurately describe the talents of the officer. This online military resume' would serve two purposes. First, it would provide a better way for senior leaders and assignment experts to identify and select officers with the talents and skill sets that best match job requirements. Second, it would provide the individual officer a method to articulate his training, education, and talents in order to 'sell' himself. While many self-development

actions may take some time to produce palpable payoffs, their completion could be immediately reflected on the military resume'. This resume' would be relevant to military, interagency, as well as civilian sector potential "employers," thus providing additional motivation for the officer to develop himself in a deliberate, disciplined manner.

### Conclusion

The Army has a strong tradition of quality leader development, and the emerging Leader Development Strategy for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Army will continue that practice. Even so, we have neglected the self-development learning domain for far too long, and must take this opportunity to strengthen this area. We can accomplish this aim by applying appropriate leadership – that is, purpose, direction, and motivation in the self-development domain by enacting the recommendations I have outlined in this paper. Taken all together, this host of embedding and reinforcing mechanisms will successfully strengthen our organizational culture of leader development, and better prepare our Army to meet the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Chief of Staff of the Army, "A Leader Development Strategy for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Army," November 25, 2009, linked from *The United States Army Training and Doctrine Command Home Page* at "New Army Leader Development Strategy released," <http://www.army.mil/info/organization/unitsandcommands/commandstructure/tradoc/> (accessed February 14, 2010), 1.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, 7.

<sup>4</sup> United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, *The U.S. Army Concept for the Human Dimension in Full Spectrum Operations – 2015-2024*, Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet 525-3-7 (Fort Monroe, VA: United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, June 11, 2008), 31.



<sup>5</sup> Leonard Wong, *Developing Adaptive Leaders: The Crucible Experience of Operation Iraqi Freedom* (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, 2003), 15.

<sup>6</sup> Chief of Staff of the Army, "A Leader Development Strategy for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Army."

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 14.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Robert H. Scales, "Too Busy to Learn," *Proceedings Magazine* 136, no. 2 (February 2010): 1,284.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, *The Army Capstone Concept*, Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet 525-3-0 (Fort Monroe, VA: United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, December 21, 2009), 1.

<sup>12</sup> Marc Prensky, "Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants," *On the Horizon*, MCB University Press 9, no. 5 (2001): 2.

<sup>13</sup> Chief of Staff of the Army, "A Leader Development Strategy for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Army," 1.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Leadership*, Field Manual 6-22 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, October 12, 2006), 8-9.

<sup>16</sup> Army Leader Development Strategy Council of Colonels *unpublished working documents*, (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Center for Army Leadership, January 2010)

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Leadership*, v.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 8-9.

<sup>19</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Training for Full Spectrum Operations*, Field Manual 7-0 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, December 12, 2008), 3-3.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 3-9.

<sup>21</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Commissioned Officer Professional Development and Career Management*, Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, December 11, 2007), i.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>23</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Training and Leader Development*, Army Regulation 350-1 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, December 18, 2009), i.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 94.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Leader Development for America's Army*, Department of the Army Pamphlet 350-58 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, October 13, 1994), i.

<sup>29</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Leadership*, 1-2.

<sup>30</sup> Edgar H. Schein, *Organizational Culture and Leadership 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1997), 12.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, 231.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Training for Full Spectrum Operations*, 3-9.

<sup>35</sup> United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, *The U.S. Army Study of the Human Dimension in the Future 2015-2024*, Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet 525-3-7-01 (Fort Monroe, VA: United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, April 1, 2008), 116.

<sup>36</sup> *My Leader Development Homepage*, <https://www.us.army.mil/suite/portal/index.jsp> (accessed February 28, 2010).

<sup>37</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Training for Full Spectrum Operations*, 3-9.

<sup>38</sup> *Multi-Source Assessment and Feedback (MSAF) Homepage* <https://msaf.army.mil/Default.aspx> (accessed February 28, 2010).

<sup>39</sup> United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, *Study of the Human Dimension*, 114.

<sup>40</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Commissioned Officer Professional Development and Career Management*, Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, December 11, 2007), i.

<sup>41</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Training for Full Spectrum Operations*, 3-3.

<sup>42</sup> John Frederick Charles Fuller, *Memoirs of an Unconventional Soldier*, (London: I. Nicholson and Watson, 1936).

<sup>43</sup> Peter Schirmer, James C. Crowley, Nancy E. Blacker, Richard R. Brennan, Jr., Henry A. Leonard, Michael Polich, Jerry M. Sollinger, Danielle M. Varda "Leader Development in Army Units: Views from the Field," 2008, linked from the *RAND Monographs Homepage* at "Monographs," <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG648/> (accessed February 28, 2010).

<sup>44</sup> U.S. Department of the Army, *Evaluation Reporting System*, Army Regulation 623-3 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, August 10, 2007), 62.